## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MONTANA BILLINGS DIVISION

FILED, ENTERED, AND NOTED IN CIVIL DOCKET DEC 1 6 2005

PATRICKE. DUFFY	- market a
Write !	Adexion
Deputy	र्भें भरें -
nt*	r.

)	Deputy
)	V. *
)	CV 04-146-BLG-RFC
)	JUDGMENT
,	VOD 5.112.11
	)

**Jury Verdict** 

Decision by Court. ORDER by U.S. District Judge Richard F. Cebull (copy attached) dated 12/8/05, adopting the Findings and Recommendations of Magistrate Anderson and granting Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.

JUDGMENT IS HEREBY ENTERED in favor of DEFENDANTS and against PLAINTIFF.

Patrick E. Duffy

**Clerk of Court** 

December 16, 2005

In Billings, Vol. #86 Page 3582

(By) Deputy Clerk

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING DATE: 12-16-05 BY: (1)

I hereby certify that a copy

of this order was mailed to:

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA

## **BILLINGS DIVISION**

RANDY DUANE OLSON,	) CV-04-146-BLG-RFC
Plaintiff,	)
VS.	)
¥3.	) ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS ) AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF
LT. MR. NODLAND and LPN KIM DAHL,	) U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE )
Defendant.	) ) )

On November 21, 2001, United States Magistrate Judge Richard W. Anderson entered his Findings and Recommendation. Magistrate Judge Anderson recommends Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment be granted.

Upon service of a magistrate judge's findings and recommendation, a party has 10 days to file written objections. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In this matter, no party filed objections to the March 3, 2004 Findings and Recommendation. Failure to object to a magistrate judge's findings

12/8/ EF Care and recommendation waives all objections to the findings of fact. *Turner v. Duncan*, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1999). However, failure to object does not relieve this Court of its burden to review de novo the magistrate judge's conclusions of law. *Barilla v. Ervin*, 886 F.2d 1514, 1518 (9th Cir. 1989).

After an extensive review of the record and applicable law, this Court finds Magistrate

Judge Anderson's Findings and Recommendation are well grounded in law and fact and adopts
them in their entirety.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc. #16) is GRANTED. Judgment should be entered in favor of Defendants Nodland and Dahl and against Plaintiff Olson and the docket should reflect that Plaintiff Olson's filing of this action counts as one strike, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), because he failed to state a claim on which relief may be granted.

The Clerk of Court shall notify the parties of the making of this Order.

DATED the day of December, 2005.

RICHARD F. CEBULL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE